

REMARKS

Claim 1 was amended to limit A to N and to remove the proviso. Claims 2 and 8, dependent from Claim 1, were amended to properly reflect compounds wherein A is N. A new Claim 16 was added, specifying a particular compound of formula Ia. New Claim 17 was added to limit B to N.

Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional or continuation application directed to subject matter cancelled herein.

Applicants amended the Abstract as requested by the Examiner

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner required restriction of the claims to one of two groups: Group I (Claims 1-8 and 15 directed to compounds of formula (I), (Ia) and (Ib); or Group II (Claims 10-14 directed to method of treatment claims). Applicants note that the Examiner actually refers to Claims 31-59 as Group II. Applicants assume that this is a typographical error.

Applicants reaffirm their election of Group I and request that Claims 10-14 be rejoined upon a finding that Claims 1-8 and 15-17 are allowable.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 15.

Claims 1-8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Perrone et al. The Examiner contends that the compound 10k in scheme 1 of Perrone is identical to the invention of Formula (I), wherein A is C-X, B is C-Y, R1 and R2 are hydrogen atoms, X is hydrogen, Y is hydrogen and Z is OH.

For the record, Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 15. Applicants believe, however, that the rejection is now moot in light of Applicants' amendment of the claims, limiting A to N. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 15.

35 U.S.C. § 112 (2nd Par.) Rejection of Claim 1.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (2nd Par.), because the claim is ambiguous in that the Examiner found the proviso self-conflicting. Applicants removed the proviso of Claim 1 and limited A to N. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of Claim 1, in light of these amendments.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 15.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-8 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Perrone et al.

For the record, Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 15. Notwithstanding, Applicants submit that the rejection is now moot in light of Applicants' amendment of Claims 1 and 8. Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of the Claims.

Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the format of the abstract of the disclosure. Applicants amended the Abstract to conform to the requirements of the MPEP and now contains less than 25 lines.

Objection to Claims 1 and 8

The Examiner objected to the Claims 1 and 8 because the variables within the claims were not separated by a comma. Applicants amended the claims, inserting commas or semi-colons at the appropriate places therein.

Objection to Dependent Claims 2-8 and 15

The Examiner objected to dependent Claims 2-8 and 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants amended Claim 1. Accordingly, such objection is obviated.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all points and concerns raised by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully request an early and favorable action in this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov. 1, 2005
Pfizer Inc.
Patent Department, MS 8260-1611
Eastern Point Road
Groton, CT 06360
(860) 715-4288

Martha G. Munchhof
Martha G. Munchhof
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 47,811